

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

Under the title LOOKING FORWARD IN AGRICULTURE a series of papers presented before several Societies and other organizations in New York State were brought together in 1915 and prepared for publication as Vol. V, No. 106, Cornell Reading Courses. After the material was in galley proof it was thought best not to publish the paper as a Reading Course. The galley proof was saved, however, and constitutes the accompanying pamphlet. One or two of the papers have been published elsewhere as indicated by the foot notes found in the text.

Beverly T. Galloway.

List of Titles

THE SCHOOL AND THE FARM OF THE FUTURE

The Future Farm

The Forces That Will Make For The Greatest
Development Of The Farm

THE PROPER ORGANIZATION OF THE FORCES MAKING FOR
A PERMANENT AGRICULTURE

THE FUTURE OF FARM BUREAU WORK

COOPERATION IN AGRICULTURE, AND THE FACTORS THAT
MAKE FOR SUCCESS

THE ORGANIZATION OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN THE STATE: MACHINERY AND METHOD

The College Has Three Functions

Lines Of Cleavage Not Desirable

The Field For Extension Teaching

A Clearing House For Collective Effort

The Use Of Projects Or Plans

The Place For The County Agent

SUMMARY

108 109
110 111
112 113

CORNELL READING COURSES

PUBLISHED BY THE NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY

VOLUME V

ITHACA, NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1916

NUMBER 106

LOOKING FORWARD IN AGRICULTURE

BEVERLY T. GALLOWAY

WE may look forward to a permanent husbandry freed from the blight of peasantry, standing squarely for its place in the affairs of the nation, but recognizing to the full its relations and its responsibilities to other industries and occupations, and recognizing further that the fullest and best development of one can be attained only through the fullest and best development of all.



Small, faint, illegible markings or text at the bottom center of the page, possibly a stamp or bleed-through.

LOOKING FORWARD IN AGRICULTURE¹

BEVERLY T. GALLOWAY

THE SCHOOL AND THE FARM OF THE FUTURE²

It is my purpose to discuss the subject assigned to me under three heads: first, the future farm, its place and its functions in the life of the nation; second, the forces that will make for the greatest development of the farm; and third, the proper organization of these forces, to the end of securing a permanent agriculture and a sound, sane, satisfactory country life.

THE FUTURE FARM

American people and the United States as a nation are at work on a problem which, so far as I know, has never attracted a great amount of attention, but which has been quietly accepted as a matter of course without a full realization of its far-reaching nature.

The problem is whether we, with all the advantages and opportunities that a great democracy is supposed to afford, will be able to develop and maintain a permanent agriculture without peasantizing the people who must look to the land for a living. None of the Old World countries have succeeded in doing this. Wherever is found a permanent agriculture and a successful agriculture, measured merely by the maintenance of soil fertility and high average crop yields, there is found a peasantized and labor-depressed people, whose days are full of toil and whose minds have never been given opportunity for growth and expansion except in a most narrow way. I have sometimes been led to believe that much of the antipathy to farming is due to a subconscious fear of the heart-breaking toil and insufficient reward that come in its train. I hear you say, "But is there antipathy to farming?" Most certainly there is, and the best evidence of the fact is found in the world-wide movement to get into other occupations in which the reward is greater and in which men's physical, mental, and social needs are given opportunity for expression and development.

While we do not have the same systems here that have kept the Old World farmer in a species of bondage, we have others that are equally objectionable, for they have brought about a kind of wage-slavery by means of which the tiller of the soil is almost as firmly bound to the merchant and the landlord as if he were a serf. There are more than a million farmers in this country to-day who must live and support their families on a labor income of less than a hundred dollars a year, and through

¹ No discussion paper is included with this number of the reading course.

² Presented at the convocation of the University of the State of New York, Albany, New York, October 1915.

a system of crop liens very little of this income actually comes to the farmer as money. He is as firmly and as effectively a chattel as was his ante-bellum prototype, and, unlike his peasant brother of the Old World, he is not subject to a benevolent autocracy that guides his actions and sees to it that he does not deplete the soil and that if he is to live at all it must be as a constructive, not as a destructive, agent. So that, despite all that has been said and will no doubt continue to be said for some time regarding the delights, the independence, the freedom, and the self-sufficiency of the farm, the people are turning from it, and will probably continue to turn from it until there is definite and positive assurance of a satisfactory reward.

It has come to be the fashion among some of our good friends to deplore these conditions and to speak and write of them as if they were a species of dissipation, which could in time be overcome and corrected by preachments and sermons. All the facts at hand point otherwise. Our people are, consciously or unconsciously, following the mandates of economic laws, and they must be reached, not by appeals to sentiment and emotion, not by striving to give them a memorized stock of traditional knowledge, but by placing before them opportunities for broadening their minds and developing their reasoning powers through education in its broadest sense in terms of their real environment. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been a steady decrease in the percentage of our population engaged in agriculture, it is encouraging to note that the per capita production of our staple crops has been increasing. I believe it can be truly stated that this is primarily due to the advances that educational work has made throughout the country, broadening the minds of our people, giving them opportunity and knowledge as to the utilization of machinery, and making it practicable to more and more utilize horse power and other power instead of man power.

And now, with this more or less incomplete picture as to what the farm and the farmer are, let us attempt to briefly epitomize what appear to be the essentials of the future farm. Despite the fact that in practically all other countries the intensity of the farming has increased with the density of population, we do not believe this need necessarily follow here. It would be unfortunate for us as a nation if this were so, because thus far an intensive agriculture has been practicable only where there is an oversupply of human labor. The bountiful crops from small areas have been made possible only by the toil and sweat of the man who, while he is able to produce these results, must do so at the expense of the mental, and I might almost say moral, side of his being. This is agricultural peasantry in its worst form, and, while much may be said on the subject of making two blades of grass grow where only one grew

before, we do not want to accomplish this by sacrificing the very things that make life worth living.

We are in the midst of a period of rapid economic changes, and these changes will have a profound effect on the future farm. With the shifting and changing in transportation methods, the development and perfection of storage and refrigeration, the introduction of the telephone, the telegraph, the trolley car, and the motor truck, the complicated methods of buying and selling, and all those economic developments and improvements, the farm is as profoundly influenced and affected as are the factory and the workshop. The farmer and the farmer's children must have time and opportunity for keeping in the front rank of all these improvements, and in order to do so he must use his head as well as his hands. This will mean that the farm of the future will so utilize modern labor-saving devices and modern methods that human labor will be reduced to a minimum, and the farmer and his children will have time, opportunity, and means of living a satisfactory, wholesome life. Undoubtedly the successful farm of the future must always require the labor of the owner's hands, but it need not be a type of labor that absorbs all the energy of the body. It will probably mean a farm of average size, rather than a very large farm or a very small one. There seems to be no question that with all our available land properly handled and skillfully managed as average-sized farms, we can produce an abundance of food. We have not approximated our potential possibilities in this respect, and, despite the persistent warning; that have been uttered from time to time during the past one hundred years, there is no evidence that our crop yields on the whole are diminishing.

Summarized, then, the future farm will be one where staple crops are grown, where machines and labor-saving devices may be utilized, where the farmer and his children will find remunerative employment, where opportunities will be given for the very best physical, moral, and mental development, and where all the tendencies will be toward the socialization of those engaged in the work. With a redirected agriculture based on the development of the farm as here described, we may look forward to a permanent husbandry freed from the blight of peasantry, standing squarely for its place in the affairs of the nation, but recognizing to the full its relations and its responsibilities to other industries and occupations, and recognizing further that the fullest and best development of one can be attained only through the fullest and best development of all.

THE FORCES THAT WILL MAKE FOR THE GREATEST DEVELOPMENT OF THE FARM

When we come to a careful and critical study of recent efforts to discover the underlying causes of the people's concern in the matter of improving

the farms and the farm life of the nation, we find that they resolve themselves largely into one of education. Our educational system is held to be primarily responsible for many of the difficulties confronting us, and, with this belief firmly entrenched in the minds of the people, education is looked to as the means of bringing relief and new light to those struggling in darkness. The demand, too, is for education that will teach the meaning of things and their relation to the present. Therefore we would put the school as the paramount force that will make for the greatest development of the farm. There are other forces not strictly belonging to the school that are doing and will continue to do good service for the farm; but, while not strictly of the school, they are educational forces, and they may become even more far-reaching than the school, for they are carrying their work directly into the homes and out to the farmers in many parts of the country. We shall speak, then, primarily of the school as a force in the development and maintenance of the future farm as we have pictured it.

We are coming to understand that much of our school work needs redirection. What is being said about introducing agriculture into our schools is with the idea, perhaps, that what we need is to make more farmers. I am not so much concerned with making more farmers as I am with making better ones. The rural schools at this time are certainly not making more farmers or better farmers, but their chief function seems to be to make more city dwellers.

In most respects our rural schools have stood still. They have moved neither backward nor forward. This arrested development is due, no doubt, to the broad and basic economic changes that have shifted the struggle for existence from the country to the city. The city to-day is more of a problem than the country, and, such being the case, it is natural that in the cities the greatest energy should be shown in the effort to provide relief. No doubt the rural people will gladly give aid to their schools as soon as they can be convinced that the schools will meet the needs of the open country. Heretofore the country school has been a thing apart from the country itself. Little effort has been made to have the school express the needs of the community and serve as the center of community welfare and community interests. The school therefore must concern itself more and more with the needs of the people. But this will be slow work, for it is contrary to many existing traditions. We look forward to the time when the school will be more of a community center, and when the teacher, instead of being a shifting and uncertain quantity, will be in the nature of a community builder.

The mere introduction of *agriculture* into the school will not accomplish the ends desired. There must be something more than this. There must

be a vitalization of all the work, so that it will be fully realized that the school is not for the preparation of life, but is life itself. It is gratifying to note that New York State has taken advanced steps to bring about changes in our rural schools that will result in a betterment of the conditions of rural life. Recent laws, such as the rural school supervision law, the law for the care of incapacitated teachers, the law for the extension of the school term, the law for the enlarged use of the school buildings for country gatherings, and the law for the introduction of agriculture into rural high schools — all are in the direction of making the rural school more and more an expression of the needs and growth of the community.

We are feeling a great need for properly trained teachers for the right conduct of the work in these redirected schools. We need a new type of normal school to train such teachers — a type that will teach, as we have already pointed out, through the meaning of things and their relations to life. Where could there be a better place for such schools than in the open country, where the environment can be made to play an important part in the educational work? A writer has well expressed this when he says that the mental conditions of the open country are just as essential to the normal development of the human mind as air, food, and exercise are to the development of the body. Nature is highly complex, and also exceedingly fine-grained. It is only in contact with this multiplicity of fine-grained facts of nature that fine-grained perceptions are developed. Human culture when set apart from nature is only a hothouse plant, unable to maintain, justify, or enjoy its own existence.

Necessarily there must be teachers who can train teachers, and these teachers of teachers need to possess the vision and the broad grasp of all the social, economic, and other questions that are involved in the development of the farm future and a future permanent agriculture. This is work for the colleges of agriculture, and that it is vitally important work is evidenced by the demands for leadership in the field.

THE PROPER ORGANIZATION OF THE FORCES MAKING FOR A PERMANENT AGRICULTURE

We have spoken of the future farm and the forces that will make for its greatest development. We have seen that in a broad sense these forces are educational. We are hearing a great deal now regarding the necessity for cooperation — cooperation in economic matters, cooperation in social matters. If it is vital that the people of the open country learn to work together in matters affecting their economic and social their welfare, it is even more vital that those who are directing the forces in the field of education and redirection of rural affairs should also strive to bring about unity of purpose. Necessarily this process will be slow, for with

the great variety of methods and ways of doing work in the different States it will be some time before anything like concerted action can be brought about.

Probably one of the greatest and most potential forces for bringing about and welding together the agencies that are to advance agriculture is to be found in the recent federal law known as the Smith-Lever Cooperative Extension Act. This measure, unlike preceding laws affecting agriculture, brings in for the first time, and develops as a dominant factor, the idea of cooperative effort. It is known as an "act to provide for cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics." There is another very essential and important feature in this act, which has not been fully grasped by the people. It is one of the first laws enacted by the Federal Congress that will bring home to the people in the respective States a direct feeling of financial responsibility in the conduct of the work of the government. The principle that the Federal Government will join with the States to help those States whose people are ready to help themselves in a financial way is unique in federal legislation. While this measure is primarily intended to carry on extension work and to carry knowledge to nonresidents in schools and colleges, it must necessarily have a far-reaching influence on the direct educational activities of all those institutions aiding agriculture. It will reach out through the agricultural colleges into elementary and secondary schools, and, if properly handled and properly directed, may be the means of centering our ideas on the value and the necessity of unity of effort in educational affairs.

I have no fear that this measure is likely to develop or tend toward a centralized authority or centralized direction of educational work. I think it may be truly said that the tendency of the affairs of the Government in matters of business is toward centralization, but in matters of education it is the other way. I should look to the Federal Government to take the lead in broad matters of organization affecting the welfare of the rural people. The Government could nationalize the work and could federate the agencies without in any way interfering with the autonomy of existing institutions. We are not so much in need of further discussion of the subject as we are of taking up specific projects which will have for their object the unification of work looking toward the improvement of our schools and the betterment of rural life. In a less general way, the State will have its function in this federation of effort. Here again the essential principles of a democratic form of government must be maintained. The agencies engaged in rural education may be tied together by friendly and cordial cooperation, and still be free to do their work, for the field is large, and we have as yet but just entered it.

I do not know that I could more fittingly close these remarks than by quoting a short paragraph from the report of the Commission on Country Life — a report that has not had the attention it deserves. The report says:

The great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization; for our civilization rests at bottom on the wholesomeness, the attractiveness, and the completeness, as well as the prosperity, of life in the country. The men and women on the farms stand for what is fundamentally best and most needed in our American life. Upon the development of country life rests ultimately our ability, by methods of farming requiring the highest intelligence, to continue to feed and clothe the hungry nations; to supply the city with fresh blood, clean bodies, and clear brains that can endure the terrific strain of modern life; we need the development of men in the open country, who will be in the future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the nation in time of war, and its guiding and controlling spirit in time of peace.

THE FUTURE OF FARM BUREAU WORK³

To those who have watched the movement to democratize agricultural knowledge during the past fifteen or twenty years, there can be no question that the farm bureau, or at least what the farm bureau stands for, has come to stay. It is unquestionably to play a part in the great movement for the betterment of the man on the land. How is it to play this part? What are some of the principles that must be observed to make the work a success? How is it to be related to other similar activities and to already established institutions? What must be the attitude of mind, the vision, and the guiding spirit of the men and women who are to take part in the work? All these are questions that we must consider and seriously ponder. When we do seriously consider and ponder these questions, we find that they involve a great deal more than merely appears on the surface. The field of farm bureau work, or any other work that makes for greater, broader, and more far-reaching social consciousness, is getting into the very heart and soul of some of the most vital questions confronting us to-day.

Everywhere we are confronted with facts that bring home to us in the most emphatic way the realization that the old days of individualistic philosophy are past. Out on the borders of some of our western States we still find this old spirit of individualism — an absolute reliance on self with little heed or thought to what happens to the other man. This is the spirit in all new countries, and we have been through it, but, while the country has changed, the spirit lives. It will take a long time for us to realize how much and how firmly entrenched it is in the open country, where there is still lacking a sense of the state, a sense of community life, and what it really means for every man to be willing at any time to join with his fellow men and work for the common good. So that as I look back over the past fifteen years and trace the movement for the betterment of the farm and the farm home through community effort, I can see that underlying it has been a growing social consciousness and a realization that we are bound together and must work together if this country is to continue to exist and to maintain itself as a democracy of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I bring these remarks in here to serve as a part of background for the statements to follow regarding the part the farm bureau man, the county agent, or whatever you may be pleased to call him, must play in this movement for community building and collective life. And now that brings me to the first and most vital point in the consideration of this question of farm bureau work, and that is leadership. Leadership that

³ Presented at the third annual meeting of farm bureau managers of New York State, Ithaca, New York, November, 1915.

means a broad vision and an understanding of the meaning of service — service for the country, service for the state, and service for all mankind. Unless a man has this vision, unless he has the ability and the power to absolutely lose sight of self and throw his soul into the work for others, he will soon sink to the level of mediocrity and can never attain the distinction of being a real community builder.

There does not seem to have come to us as yet a full realization of the vital importance of the human element in this farm bureau and county agent work. In the early days we had just a few simple problems, and we gave little thought to the question of relationships and the need for the careful study of the material things, such as crops and livestock. But to the human resources, collectively speaking, we gave even less heed, the chief problem being to reach the individual farmer and to persuade him in some way to farm a little better. Our present and real problem is much more complicated. We have selected the county as a sort of arbitrary unit, not because it is the best, but for practical administrative purposes it is perhaps the easiest to handle. In the county are many communities with varied and divergent interests, all acting and reacting on each other. There are also many forces, economic, social, religious, political — all to be considered. True leadership will recognize all these forces, will study and visualize them, not for the purpose of setting one force against the other, not so much for the purpose of developing new forces, but primarily in order to find out how to most effectively and efficiently mold all these forces and bring them to bear on one common object, that is, the greatest good to the greatest number. Here it seems to me is one of the finest fields for real service that could be offered to any man or woman. Our schools and colleges and our great universities are of necessity as yet more or less artificial. The country is natural. The community is life. The community is the greatest school in the world. What a privilege to be of it, and in it, and working for it!

Just on the outskirts of one of the cities of India, and nestling among the hills in a beautiful shaded grove, is an exquisite little temple, whose quiet simplicity and wonderful beauty appeal to every passer-by. The story is told that long ago a community decided to build a temple, and that all the forces were appealed to for help. Many expensive gifts were brought, and much material was offered for the work, so much in fact that divergent views developed as to just how it could be used. Leaders were selected from time to time to direct the work, but these leaders were mostly successful in developing lines of cleavage, with the result that the temple was not built, and the community was further divided. One day there came a priest, old and worn, but full of zeal for the common good, whose advice was asked, and it was, "Put away your differences, forget

all selfish interest, and focus your minds on this one object for the common good." He was asked to lead, with the result that this temple stands as a monument to true leadership and a spirit of real community service.

No farm bureau can render its best service if out of it there develop lines of cleavage, or divergent interests, that will set one group up or over against another group. If this appears to be the result, the place to seek the cause is not so much in the forces at work, but in the manner in which these forces are being moved and directed to a common end. It comes right back to the man whose job it is to bring things to pass. Therefore, I say, seek the difficulties, if there are such, not in the job, not in the forces that must be brought into the job, but in the man who is back of the job. It will be no small task that confronts the farm bureau man of the future, for not only must the leader be able to bring unity of purpose among those with whom and for whom he works, but he must establish and maintain careful and friendly relationships with many outside agencies that he will have to use. He must recognize himself as first of all a part of a great national movement, and as such he must be prepared to seek and secure help whenever and wherever such help will be useful. In another paper I have presented this idea somewhat after the following fashion.

The county leader, farm bureau manager, or county agent, as we may choose to call him, will be a joint representative of the people in the county and of all the agents or agencies that may wish to help him, or that he may wish to have help him, in organizing all available forces for better farming, better business, and better living, in his community. For any one agent or any combination of agencies to attempt to dominate and force upon the people something from the outside would be very unfortunate. Every laudable effort should be made to arouse the community, but unless the community itself arouses and puts money, time, and energy into the work, it will be lamentably slow. The county agent or farm bureau man must know his people and the local conditions. He must be an organizer and a user of men, rather than an individualistic dispenser of knowledge. In other words, this man must become an organizer of forces and must learn to use these forces, under the best guidance that he can secure, in the building of the community that he represents. With the communities properly organized and feeling a direct interest in the work they are doing, growth will be natural and lasting, for it will come from within.

I think now we can begin to visualize the future farm bureau and the future farm bureau work. I shall, of course, not attempt to specify or to enter upon details or objects, methods of procedure or ways of organization — these must of necessity vary in different States and even in different parts

of the same State. There is one feature of farm bureau work, however, to which I wish to call particular attention, and which must have the serious consideration of every one looking to the broad development of this work. That feature is work having to do with the farm home and the farm woman and girls in the farm home. I am not saying that this particular phase of country life has been neglected during the past ten or fifteen years, but I would like to record the fact that it has not received the attention it deserves. This is partly due to lack of leadership, for, while it has not been so difficult to find men, even without any technical training, who have made good community leaders and builders, women who could do this work, or would do it, have been extremely difficult to find. The home-loving women, the home-building women, very properly regard it as their first duty to care for their own homes. They have little time, even if they have the inclination, to go out and work for the community. In the pioneer days of this work in the Southern States we could almost always find men ready to volunteer, but the women would shake their heads and point to the children and the home. I do not think there could be a finer attribute in women than this love of home, this interest for the protection and the welfare of the home first and above all things. So much more is it our duty to help the farm woman and to place within her reach the agencies that will bring this about. How are we to do this? First, we must have leaders, womanly women, tactful, diplomatic, broad-minded, and sympathetic, keenly aware of the real problems of the farm home, and possessed of the God-given vision that will enable them to get the viewpoint of those with whom they must work.

And now, with these somewhat broad and general ideals before us, let us endeavor to picture as concretely as we can what, with our present knowledge and vision, would seem to be the future of farm bureau work. In developing this picture it must be borne in mind that it must be more or less a composite one. It is not intended to fit any particular State or any particular part of a State. If there is any one thing in all this great field of education for all the people all the time, it is that we should get away from the old idea of state lines, county lines, or any other artificial boundaries, for this idea is nothing more than the recrudescence of individualism born of frontier life and frontier conditions. Our frontiers have disappeared. Men no longer have unlimited room for expansion. They are touching elbows at many places in many ways, and in the brotherhood of man there are no divisional lines. We find, of course, that for some time to come we shall have to face in part the old situation, but our ideals should aim toward the closest unity and harmony of purpose. These we may hope to secure through frequent meetings and discussions and with the wise guidance of those institutions that have been selected and authorized by the people to guide them. Now as to our picture.

1. We see the farm bureau work handled largely as local or community activities. Communities are much like individuals. No individual can grow unless he serves. No community can grow economically, socially, morally, or ethically unless it is aroused to the need of service. Growth to be permanent must come from within, and the only way it can come from within is for the people who constitute the community to move, to act, to do something, be it ever so little, for the common good. In the old days when we selected a good farmer, because he was a good farmer, in the community to go out and help other farmers, the most surprised man was the good farmer himself, for he found at once that the mere fact of his helping other farmers helped him as much or more than it did his neighbors. So that viewing the future farm bureau work from almost any angle, we are led irresistibly back to the idea that if it is to be permanent, if it is to accomplish its aims economically, socially, and I might almost say, morally, and ethically, it must be an outgrowth of local spirit, wisely guided, but not directed nor dominated by any agency or agencies from without.

2. We see the farm bureau work an outgrowth of local spirit, wisely guided, but not directed nor dominated by any agency or agencies from without. What does this mean? Frankly it means that the Federal Government, with the powerful support it has already given and will no doubt continue to give, the state governments through agricultural colleges, boards, and departments of agriculture, and all other proper agencies, public and private, will unite and cooperate to place before and in the hands of the local committees all those things that will be most helpful in helping them to help themselves. This will mean funds, advice, sympathy, support, and, more important than all, a nation-wide united and consistent idealism, which is found in the broad and generous meaning of the word *cooperation*. Cooperation for what? Not for bureaucratic or centralized control or direction, not for a system that will make our farm people merely receivers, but for a plan and a system that will quicken social consciousness and make our people givers. This is the real meaning of the word cooperation as it was written into the Lever Bill, and, while we cannot expect to attain all at once the high ideals there expressed, we can work toward them and for them with all the zeal at our command.

3. We see the farm bureau work of the future wisely guided and directed by local leaders with vision, with sound ideals, and with that most rare and uncommon thing, common sense. These leaders must be in the community and of the community they serve. If the leader is successful in becoming an integral part of the community, if he really discovers it, learns it, and loves it, the rest will not be difficult. He should never lose

LOOKING FORWARD IN AGRICULTURE

III

sight of the fact for a moment that he is the crystallizing agent, the motive power, whose job it is to bring the forces together and to mold and unite them for the common good. And right here let me say that self effacement is the most potent force of all in accomplishing the results to be desired. The minute a man begins to visualize himself as a part of every project that he may be engaged on, that minute he loses much of his power of bringing things to pass. The greatest pleasure and satisfaction that can come to any one engaged in constructive, administrative, or organization work, is the pleasure of standing away on the side lines, completely off the field, and quietly watching results unfold themselves — results that he alone may know are due in some part, large or small, to his efforts.

We see this local leader, farm bureau manager, county agent, or whatever he may be called, representing and utilizing his own people, various agencies, national and state, and all the proper forces at his command, for the help and the betterment of his community. Surely this is a man-sized job, and no man who is now in it or is intending to go into it should fail to grasp the fact that there bulks large the opportunity for service — service of the most inspiring kind.

4. And finally, we see the farm bureau work of the future a rounded-out work, reaching not only into the things that affect the farmer, such as his crops, his livestock, his markets, and his business, but also into that which comes, or should come, even closer than all other things, and that is the home. Here we men are on delicate ground, so delicate in fact that we must step aside and give place to the women, who for all time have been the guardians and the keepers of the home, and who, in the wisdom of Providence let us hope, will always continue in this high office. We therefore see woman's work in the home and for the home an integral and intimate part of all future farm bureau activities. This must necessarily come slowly, but come it must. I can see no need for separate machinery or separate organization for this type of work. The farm bureau will be the clearing house, and the woman's work will be articulated with it in such a way as to give full freedom in methods, in procedure, and in the use of proper subject matter. So essential is leadership and proper training in this work that it will likely be some time before it can be systematized and projected in even a small part of the places where the farm bureau proper is already well established. In this State we are now ready for three or perhaps four of these farm bureau projects for work in the farm home. When I say *ready*, I mean that the communities themselves are ready to do their share and are awake to the need of the work, that trained leaders can be secured, that the subject matter is sufficiently organized to make it available and useful, and that certain

definite means of approach have been worked out. With the means of approach no longer an experiment, and with the work to be given clearly planned and formulated, there will be little question as to its success, keeping always in mind, of course, those essentials of leadership to which we have already referred. Food, clothing, and housing will no doubt constitute the essentials in this work for some time. More vital still is the problem of children. What a fatuitous theory it is that holds that because a woman is a woman she should know all about how to care for children and how to protect them against the many ills to which they are subject! The men cannot even depend on themselves in the matter of looking after the ills of their livestock. No, let us look forward to a future farm bureau work that, to quote an earnest laborer in the field, "should give us in every county, or in every rural community, two kinds of workers — the visiting nurse and the county representative — women of broad education, broad sympathies, with a keen knowledge of the subjects to be taught and how to teach them, women to whom the farm woman would feel she could go for sympathy and counsel, women who are physically strong enough to stand hardships of poor railroads and poor hotels, women who will be glad to be the bearers of the gospel of better homes, better children, and a more contented and a happier rural population."

COOPERATION IN AGRICULTURE, AND THE FACTORS THAT MAKE FOR SUCCESS⁴

As a means of establishing a background for what is to be said, it may be well to review briefly the growth in this country of the movement for organization among farmers to the end that a more equitable share in the profits of their labor might be secured. For the past five or six years it has been possible for the writer to watch the barometer of public sentiment through its reaction on the members of the National Congress. Judging by the hearings and discussion before committees, and judging further by the bills introduced with little or no expectation that they will ever be passed, it appears that the great pressure for action in the matter of securing changes in the present methods of distributing and marketing farm products has come not so much from the farmers themselves as from nonproducers who are feeling the pinch of a constantly increasing cost of living. There is a great ground swell of interest, almost anxiety, that the farmer should do something, or that something should be done for the farmer, to relieve the present situation, which is steadily growing more acute in all countries the world over.

The subject is world-wide in its bearing. Its economic, ethical, and social ramifications are far-reaching and intricate, and it will doubtless be a long time before a sensible impression can be produced on the many-threaded and tangled skein. There would appear to be no question that many of the efforts being made are born of the best intentions; but from the very nature of things they are destined to fail, for the reason that they are built on the shifting sands of theory rather than on the solid rock of experience.

Man's great struggle, in bringing himself out of the abysmal darkness of barbarism, has been to find practical ways to live, to work, and to play in cooperation with his fellow man. Progress in this matter has never been continuous nor in straight lines. It never has proceeded, and in all likelihood never will proceed, from above. It must come from within. So that, looking at all that is now going on in the way of national and state legislation to bring about cooperation whether or no, it may be regarded as a necessary step in the evolution of public sentiment. Out of it there will doubtless come, step by step, a clear vision of the essentials, and as these come they must be seized and held until another safe footing can be gained.

In some ways democracies have advantages in pushing forward the economic and social welfare of the people. The process is expensive, however, and many mistakes must necessarily be made; but the power of correcting them is never removed. Democracy breeds independence

⁴ Presented at the seventy-fifth annual meeting of the New York Agricultural Society, Albany, New York, January, 1915.

and individualism — marked characteristics of every American-born citizen. Nearly every man, especially if he is a producer of crops, has the feeling that he would like to be free and unhampered in everything pertaining to his work — the making of his product, its distribution, and its marketing. Now, it is a well-known fact that as a rule the producer of crops — the farmer — has little knowledge of the essential elements of business. He is not a trained business man. Therefore he is not, by training and experience, in a position to meet business problems and to handle them in a businesslike way. What is true of the farmer is true to a large extent of the ultimate consumer of the things the farmer produces. This condition develops the necessary material and basis for the growth and production of a very complicated and organized set of men who fill the gap between the producer and the consumer.

The farmer, bent on his desire to produce crops and not realizing the advances being made in the matter of organized business and business conduct, fails to appreciate that the power to act independently and individually has been largely taken out of his hands. He also fails to realize that that power is going to stay out of his hands, and that his only hope for the future is to get into the full current of economic progress.

For years the farmer has been led to believe, and in the majority of cases he still believes, that he is not only a capitalist, but also a laborer and the manager of an industry. This is true only where the farmer is so fortunately situated that he can act not only as a producer, but also as a transportation agent and a direct salesman. Such instances are rare; so that the million of husbandmen must now, and even more in the future, recognize that the very instruments which in their own hands would make them capitalists, laborers, and managers of industries, are now in the hands of others and are likely to stay there. In other words, there was a time when the farmer was practically the master of all the tools of his profession. He is no longer that master. Transportation companies and corporations, storage and warehouse organizations, commission men, jobbers, middlemen, and dealers, all are a part of the organized machinery with which the farmer has to deal. It is no wonder that, working as he does, he can retain such a small part of what he actually produces.

While the past four or five decades have greatly increased the productive power of the farmer, he has in no wise profited commensurately. Fifty years ago it required nearly five hours of human labor to produce a bushel of corn. Now the same amount is produced with little more than thirty minutes of human labor. The cost of production has been reduced from about thirty-five cents a bushel to less than ten cents a bushel. Has the farmer received a fair share of this profit? The human

labor required in producing a bushel of wheat is now probably less than ten minutes. Fifty years ago it was eighteen times more than this. Fifty years ago it required thirty-five hours of human labor to produce a bale of hay. Scythes, pitchforks, and hand balers were time consumers. In fifty years the human labor required has been reduced to eleven hours. By all the rules of justice and by the laws of economics, the farmer should be receiving to-day eight or ten times larger returns from the product of his labor than he did forty or fifty years ago. As a matter of fact he is receiving no such increase. So that one of his present problems is, how can he get more?

It is not to be expected that the farmer will be able to revolutionize society to the extent of having it return to him the power to receive the full fruits of his labor. He must have a larger share, however; otherwise the people — the nonproducers — must make up their minds to pay the cost, or else must greatly simplify their methods of living as to both food and clothing. Doubtless the latter will be the ultimate result; but it will take a long time to reach adjustments such as are found in Japan and some older countries, where living has been equalized and simplified to a degree well worthy of careful thought and study.

And now, with this background, let us see, what are some of the practical things that we can do to meet the issues before us — things that not only will serve some immediate practical end, but also will be of such a nature that their general tendency will be in the direction of the development of an economic framework, just to the producer, just to the consumer, and just to all those intermediaries who are a part, and must in a large measure continue to be a part, of our advancing civilization. Thus, without further argument — if argument is necessary at all — we arrive at our first proposition; namely, that if agriculture is to continue to prosper under a democratic form of government, if we are to be a nation of freemen of the soil, if we are to escape what all the older nations have come to — an agricultural peasantry — we must organize industry. And that means cooperation.

It may sound like heresy or may savor of the paradoxical to express the opinion that the combined efforts of the Federal and State Governments, through legislation, have done as much as almost any other one thing to set back progress in the organization of agriculture. The tendency of most action proceeding from legislation is to force something down on the farmers from above, rather than to build up a structure from below. No amount of legislation, no amount of argument, no amount of propaganda, will permanently establish organization and cooperation unless there is involved some vital, persistent, economic necessity or some great moral question that goes to the very root of life itself.

For all practical purposes we can concern ourselves at the present time with those matters that have to do with material things. We must begin at the business end, and when we learn a few of the small and elementary things to be done there and how to do them, we shall have made the beginning of further progress into more complicated fields of endeavor. All will doubtless realize, on a moment's reflection, that the old order of things has passed away, never to return — when the farmer did not need to look beyond the horizon of his own community in the shaping of his work and of his life.

Railways, trolley lines, the telegraph and the telephone, have made of the farmer a world figure. He must think, must work, and must act as a man of the world. He must look beyond his community, his State, and even his own country, for the influences that govern his life. Recognizing these facts, it would seem that the safest and most tangible place to begin in the organization of rural life is with the things the farmer has to sell and those he has to buy. A study of the subject during the past three or four years leads to the conclusion that it would be unwise to attempt as yet to organize anything with the predominant idea directive rather than investigative. It seems very proper to ask whether we are ready to give specific information or direction as to how, when, and where to organize. Organization is a very human thing, a very personal matter, and any attempt to deal with it in any way except largely on a personal basis is doomed to failure. We are getting much advice and help from economists, but we lack practical first-hand knowledge as to the facts.

Speaking in general terms, there are two kinds of leaders of men: those who are able, capable, and willing at all times to express their views as to how to do things and what kind of things should be done; and those who do things, but talk and say very little about them, drawing their inspiration in many cases from those who have done the talking. Of course there are all shades and gradations between these extremes. So far most of the effort in the field of rural organization has been put forth by the men who have been telling us the things that should be done and how to do them. It seems to me that we have reached a time when the constructive organizers should be given an opportunity to develop, in very small ways at first, some of the things about which so much has been said. Leadership in investigation and organization seems to be the crying need at the present time.

In the study of the growth of crops, the breeding of animals and plants, diseases, insects, and all those things that have advanced our knowledge of agriculture, we have used the laboratory method. We have proceeded inductively. As one of our great educators has said:

"This method proceeds from the observations of the concrete and practical. It seeks the fact; it thinks little of the abstract, of the speculative. It does not rely on any kind of revelation. It goes after the truth — the facts — and having observed them by eye or ear or touch or other sense process it compares fact with fact, group of facts with group, and from that comparison and the resulting classification it draws some very limited inferences. Then, there is another step in advance, not a far-reaching speculation away out among the stars, not a full-fledged theory, but the very next step beyond the facts observed."

By this time the reader may be asking, "What is the point? Assuming that all or some of these statements are correct, what is to be done about it? What is the practical program? What are the factors that make for success in cooperation in agriculture, and how are they to be determined?"

All these agencies, federal and state, that are charged with the work of aiding the farmer in the organization of the industry he represents, should recognize that the fundamental need at the present time is the facts. There are already in existence many forms of cooperative effort. Some of these are successful; others are not. Wrecks and near-wrecks of agencies are to be found everywhere. They all need to be studied, classified, and grouped, so that safe and sane conclusions may be drawn regarding them. The Federal Government has fortunately planned its work on this basis. It is now engaged in an investigation, not a propaganda, of organized agencies involved in marketing perishable products; systems of accounting and auditing; forms of by-laws; surveys of the available market supplies; methods of growing, packing, storing, and shipping farm produce as practiced by successful organized cooperative agencies; methods of distribution, including transportation agencies of various kinds; warehousing and refrigerating concerns; public and municipal markets; wholesale terminal markets; and other allied matters.

The predominant idea here is to obtain the facts, so that these facts may be used in advising and assisting, through demonstrations and otherwise, those who may wish to undertake work along the lines indicated. It is the application of the inductive method already described. The State of New York, through its Department of Food and Markets, has recently entered upon a work similar in most respects to the foregoing, although the predominant idea in its program is instructional rather than investigative.

The writer's own view is that the greatest permanent progress in this field is to come from the investigative side. Successful application will naturally follow as a by-product of investigative work. To advise and

urge and even assist communities or individuals to organize for the purpose of cooperation in marketing farm products is unavailing unless previous careful investigation has shown that the chief essentials to success are present.

There is a field for the agricultural colleges in the various States to aid the organized agencies, especially in the matter of investigative work. The New York State College of Agriculture has organized a Rural Community Service Committee, whose functions will be, first, to investigate organization as affecting the farmer's income, and second, to investigate organization as affecting the well-being of rural life.

Under the first heading it is planned to make a study of the existing successful organizations within the State engaged in the marketing of farm produce. The study will naturally include questions of standardization, branding, accounting, business management, relation with consumers, advertising, warehousing, and storing; community abattoirs and transportation agencies, including parcel post and express companies, in their relation to successful cooperative effort; agencies engaged in the purchase of farm supplies, such as fertilizers, seed, farm implements and tools, livestock, and stock feeds; the financing of agricultural activities; and the agencies engaged in making farm loans, such as building and loan associations in aid of agriculture, and mutual, fire, accident, and other insurance.

Under the second heading it will be necessary to proceed more slowly and more cautiously. Organization for the purpose of aiding in the general well-being of rural life is more difficult of consummation than that dealing with material things such as the marketing of farm products. Rural health and sanitation, and rural social technology and engineering, are matters of vital importance, however, and must be carefully and critically studied if the best interests of the farm and the farmer are to be advanced. Water supply, sewage and drainage disposal, food selection and standardization, and household conveniences, are matters that vitally concern the community. Rural education, the study of the principles governing the successful organization and work of school clubs, fairs, and sports, are also matters of importance to the well-being of any community.

So much for the program. Now as to some of the factors that make for success:

1. It must be recognized that cooperation in agriculture is humanistic and personal, and cannot be programmed, blue-printed, diagramed, or specified, and set down on a group of men or a community. The motive must come largely from within and must be allowed to work outward. Small groups must first be organized, with an aim, an object

that will hold them together and will give them confidence and power to gradually extend their sphere of action and of usefulness.

2. Cooperation in agriculture is most likely to succeed if it is based at first on material things. It will need to be fairly special in its application. The harvesting, grading, transporting, storing, and selling of a particular crop or product — milk, eggs, butter, cheese, strawberries, or lettuce or other vegetables grown under glass — are some of the special subjects that offer common ground on which a group of men may work together for the benefit of all. The limiting factor here will be the power and ability to standardize, for an unstandardizable product is not capable of successful cooperative handling and marketing. By virtue of this very fact the organization unit is limited by soil, climate, and all things that tend toward dissimilarity in the quality or the uniformity of the product.

3. Any cooperative effort or organization must recognize that it is in the field to compete for business. The rules governing business success must therefore be most generally and rigidly observed. A great many of the failures in the organization of cooperative agencies have resulted through lack of appreciation of the need of good business management. The most successful agricultural cooperative agencies in existence to-day owe their success in large measure to the business ability of their leaders. Too often it is the case that in the organization of a cooperative agency some one from the community who may have little or no experience, or very limited experience, in business matters is put in charge, with the result that the work does not live long. Trained business leaders are needed for this field of activity, and here again the College of Agriculture would serve a useful purpose if it could establish courses in which fundamental training in this line could be given.

THE ORGANIZATION OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN THE STATE: MACHINERY AND METHOD⁵

Cooperative extension work in agriculture is still in a formative stage; furthermore, conditions in the States vary widely, so that it would seem neither safe nor wise at this time to attempt to outline a definite plan of organization that would be applicable everywhere. Without doubt, the States that are now fairly well organized and are pushing their work along clearly defined lines will find it necessary to make many modifications in the light of experience as the work proceeds. There are certain general principles, however, that would seem to hold everywhere, and it is these that we propose to discuss, rather than matters of detail, which must be largely left to those in charge of the work.

THE COLLEGE HAS THREE FUNCTIONS

Judging from numerous inquiries and from projects we have had opportunity of noting, there is still considerable haziness as to the field that an extension service might properly cover. As fundamental to proper organization and method it should be kept in mind that an agricultural college has three clearly defined functions: namely, (1) research, or the acquiring of knowledge; (2) resident instruction, or the formal teaching of existing knowledge; and (3) extension, which is primarily educational and is carrying agricultural knowledge to the people rather than requiring the people to come to a prescribed place to receive the knowledge. We use the word *knowledge* here in its broadest sense, meaning all those things that make for the betterment of rural life — material, social, and recreational. The point we wish to emphasize is that an extension service presupposes the existence and availability of knowledge to extend.

The dominant idea pervading the Smith-Lever Cooperative Extension Act is that there is a vast amount of existing knowledge to be made available to the people, and the act provides the means and prescribes the methods for making it available. It is evident, therefore, that in the organization of extension work, especially that which is to be supported out of Smith-Lever funds and the State's contribution thereto, experiments, investigations, and surveys designed wholly or in part to secure *new* facts can have no place. On the other hand, it would seem perfectly proper to conduct trials, tests, and demonstrations in fields, barns, and elsewhere, in order to more clearly bring to the attention of farmers and others the vital point of a known fact.

LINES OF CLEAVAGE NOT DESIRABLE

So much for the work to be done; now for a few words as to administrative organization. I am convinced that any plan of organization

⁵ Presented at the meeting of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, Berkeley, California, August, 1915.

LOOKING FORWARD IN AGRICULTURE

121

that permits of lines of cleavage between different groups of workers will not bring the best results. Hence, I would not advocate separate administrative groups under research, teaching, and extension. Successful administration in all such work will depend greatly on the development of a proper cooperative spirit and the realization that the thing to be sought is a group of men devoted to a purpose, rather than a piece of machinery designed and run because it operates as a good machine. Even the best machines are faulty. They require much care and adjustment, and it not infrequently happens that a considerable force must be ready to prevent the real or fancied encroachment of other machines.

We believe, therefore, that the most feasible, efficient, and altogether satisfactory method of organization is to center the chief administrative authority in the president or the dean of the college, who will have power to delegate various activities to individuals, committees, or groups of men as necessity arises. Each subject-matter department of the college, including a department of extension teaching, may have its workers in research, teaching, and extension, with the office of the president or the dean serving as the clearing house for the various activities. Such a plan permits of complete mobility; it is capable of unlimited growth, as experience has shown; it enables the administrative head to organize his forces so as to put emphasis on the problem rather than method; and it is a powerful agent for the development of a spirit of cooperation and democracy, without which no institution, such as a college of agriculture, can do its best work. It may do these things, furthermore, without interfering with departmental autonomy or integrity, keeping always in mind the fact that it must be the college as a whole that expresses itself through its extension activities, and not merely a part of the college. In such a plan there is a place for a department of extension teaching coordinate with the other departments of the college and properly functioning in research, teaching, and certain types of extension activities.

THE FIELD FOR EXTENSION TEACHING

It may be well to elaborate briefly on the functions of a department of extension teaching. As extension activities develop and funds become available for growth, it will be necessary to study and ascertain the best methods of conducting the work. There will necessarily arise questions as to methods of organization, and these questions can be answered only after careful study, so that research will be required.

There is also another very important field; that is, the training of teachers qualified to properly conduct extension work. With the wonderful growth that these activities have had in the past few years and the promise of future development, due to the cumulative funds from federal

and state sources, there will be felt more and more the need of men and women well-trained for service. It is very evident that we must give careful attention to the courses of study and the educational philosophy that must prevail in the training of such persons. Educationally the problem would seem more difficult in some respects than training for research. Experience has shown that it is more difficult to secure the adoption of existing knowledge than it is to acquire new knowledge. Special attention therefore must be given to the perfecting of courses of instruction, through training of teachers in extension work; and this, together with the training of teachers for the regular work of the colleges and secondary schools, will become a very important duty of our agricultural institutions.

The growth of extension work and the demand for extension teachers will probably have much to do with bringing about a movement toward the perfecting of collegiate courses of instruction for all agricultural students. The agricultural colleges have been backward in this matter of training teachers in agriculture and mechanic arts. In a report made by a national commission on vocational education, which resulted in the formulation of a vocational educational bill, it is shown that of the appropriations amounting to over two million and a half dollars made by Congress under the Hatch and Nelson Acts for the year 1912-1913, less than thirty-four thousand dollars was expended in the training of teachers for agricultural work. We would regard it, therefore, as a legitimate function of a department of extension teaching, coordinating with a properly organized department of rural education in the college of agriculture, to prepare men and women for the important field of extension service.

A CLEARING HOUSE FOR COLLECTIVE EFFORT

A department of extension teaching may also function in another important way, and that is in organizing and administering collective effort, such as may be involved in the conduct of movable schools, the organization of reading and study clubs, Farmers' Week conferences, joint lectures, the management of demonstration cars, exhibits at fairs, and the like. The department of extension teaching may take the initiative in organizing collective work, or the administrative head of the college may group the men, using the department of extension teaching as a clearing house. On the other hand, there may be lines of extension work intimately connected with the activities of the experiment station, or the college, which can be directed best by the subject-matter department. Or it may develop that men from two or more subject-matter departments may unite in an extension project. The work in such instances would clear through the office of the president or the dean. The

plan here suggested may appear complicated and difficult to put into effect, but after all it is comparatively simple. There is abundant evidence that attempts to sharply divide responsibility and to group more or less artificial divisions under separate heads, leads to the development of lines of cleavage and twilight zones. The latter are especially objectionable in any institution such as a college of agriculture, for men get lost in them, and it may take more time and effort to find and keep track of the lost ones than it does to direct those who are out in the light.

THE USE OF PROJECTS OR PLANS

So far we have dealt with the chief essentials of organization: namely, subject-matter departments doing research, teaching, and extension; a department of extension teaching, coordinating with other departments; the centralization of administration in the office of the president or the dean; and the organization of team work, using the department of extension teaching as a clearing house for certain types of collective effort, and the office of the president or the dean for all major projects or project groups involving one or more specialists. A thoroughly developed project plan is essential to the best success, and extension work lends itself admirably to such a plan. On the manner in which the projects are formulated and the work assigned will depend much of the success of any scheme of organization and method.

Projects should be clear-cut, but should not be too much subdivided. Projects should clearly indicate the leader and his associates, if there are any. Careful attention should be given to the nomenclature of the project, the object or objects to be attained, and the method of procedure. Cooperative relations and financial responsibilities and liabilities should also be fully set forth. The projects may be so grouped and tabulated as to give almost at a glance a sort of graphic picture of all the extension activities of the institution, such as the persons involved, the places where the work is being conducted, the relationships with other organizations within the State or the nation, the cost of the work, and the objects to be accomplished.

THE PLACE FOR THE COUNTY AGENT

In any consideration of principles that should govern in the organization and method of conducting extension work, we must give thought to the place and the function of a county adviser, or a county agent. I think it can be stated without question that our ideas regarding the place and the function of this very important officer will undergo rapid changes in the next few years. In the evolutionary process now under way the county agent in many places is becoming something more than an adviser

on crops and animals. He is a community builder, and as such he must be more a part of the community than he is of the college or any other institution with which he is associated. When the first steps were taken in a southern State twelve or fifteen years ago, inaugurating a movement that resulted in the farmer's discovery that he could help himself, a great advance was made. We must now aim to develop this spirit in whole communities, so that communities will learn to help themselves. Any one who has studied the subject knows how very slow a process it is to reach farmers by individual, personal contact. With agents in every county in the United States, acting merely as advisers, it would be long years before much of any impress could be made.

What, then, shall be the rôle of the agent? Briefly, he should be a joint representative of the people in the county, and of the college, the Federal Government, or any other agent or agencies that may wish to help him — or that he may wish to have help him — in organizing all available forces for better farming, better business, and better living in his community. For the college, or any other agency, to attempt to dominate or to stereotype this work would be very unfortunate. Through the agents the college may seek to arouse the community, but unless the community itself arouses and puts effort, money, time, and energy into the work, it will be lamentably slow. A county agent should know his people and the local conditions; but he must be an organizer and a user of men, rather than an individualistic peripatetic dispenser of knowledge. In other words, the county agent must become an organizer of forces, and must learn to use these forces, under the guidance and help of the college, in the building of the community he represents. With the communities properly organized and feeling a direct interest in the work they are doing, growth will be natural and lasting, for it will come from within.

It is important that the county agent should also have clear-cut projects, some of which may be general in their nature, some less general, and some quite local. By a proper articulation of the county agent's work with the college, all activities in the county may be properly coordinated. While the county agent therefore is not, strictly speaking, a part of the extension machinery of the college, he is in a position to use all of the extension machinery, including specialists and experts, whenever occasion demands.

A SUMMARY

Let us now briefly summarize some of the essential points that should be noted in connection with organization and method in extension work.

1. Extension work is primarily an educational movement. It is carrying agricultural knowledge to the people, rather than requiring the people to come to some prescribed place to receive the knowledge.

LOOKING FORWARD IN AGRICULTURE

125

2. By virtue of the Morrill Land Grant Act, the Second Morrill Act, the Nelson Amendment, the Hatch and Adams Acts, the Smith-Lever Act, and by state legislative enactments in most of the States, the land grant colleges have come to be recognized and designated as the proper educational agencies in the respective States for the conduct of agricultural extension work provided for by state and federal funds.

3. The land grant colleges of the respective States should be regarded as the smallest units through which the Federal Government will function in cooperative extension work within the States.

4. Each department of the college, *including a department of extension teaching*, may have its extension professors, assistant professors, and instructors, for developing subject-matter projects. The more general collective forms of extension work, such as demonstration schools, farm trains, fair exhibits, reading courses, and the like, may be conducted through the department of extension teaching, as a department coordinate with the other subject-matter departments of the college, the office of the president or the dean to be the coordinating and clearing office for all departmental and college projects.

5. As an agency for field service, the county farm bureau is recommended. This should be a local organization and should not be recognized as a part of the extension work of the college proper. In order to provide the necessary administrative machinery for handling such county farm bureaus as may be organized, there should be a state leader, provided with such necessary assistants as may be required, who will be located at the college of agriculture. Subject to the approval of the president or the dean of the college, cooperative projects with the farm bureau agents could be made operative through the state leader of farm bureaus.

A county farm bureau therefore is a local organization of farmers formed for the purpose of providing necessary machinery for collective effort in attacking the problems confronting the farmer and the farm woman. It is also a local headquarters, or clearing house, for agricultural information and for the extension work of the college of agriculture and such other agencies as may wish to cooperate. The county farm bureau agent, or the local officer in charge of the farm bureau, is the representative of the local association or organization back of the bureau, of the state college of agriculture, of the United States Department of Agriculture, or of other agencies that may be cooperating.



